

### **REMARKS**

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 8, and 10-12 to more appropriately claim the invention.

In the Office Action dated August 10, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 ("*Riggins*").

### **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (IDS)**

Applicant filed an IDS on March 12, 2001 with a PTO-1449 form and one cited document. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the document and return the PTO-1449 form with appropriate notations indicating that it was considered.

### **CLAIMS 1-6**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Riggins* because the cited reference fails to teach each and every element recited in the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8th Ed. May 2004).

Particularly, *Riggins* fails to teach at least means for acquiring first revocation list information recorded on a recording medium of a first media type detachably connected to the electronic apparatus, as recited in amended claim 1. In contrast, *Riggins* merely discloses a website 130 that is contacted by a client 125 using a temporary certificate 400, and that asks a web server engine 303 to download a certificate revocation list 335. (Col. 11, lines 14-16). Client 125 acquires certificate revocation list 335 from server 115. Server 115 is not detachably connected to client 125. Rather, server 115 is connected to client 125 via a computer network 155. (Col. 5, lines 34-40; col. 6, lines 59-63). Since *Riggins* is directed to a computer network system in which server 115 is

connected to client 125 via computer network 155, one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify server 115 to be a recording medium of a first media type detachably connected to an electronic apparatus.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Riggins* should be withdrawn and claim 1 should be allowed. Further, claims 2-6 should be allowed at least by virtue of their dependence upon allowable claim 1, in addition to the patentable subject matter respectively recited therein.

#### **CLAIMS 7-12**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Riggins* because amended claim 7 contains recitations similar to the ones recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 7-12 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claims 1-6.

#### **CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 10, 2004

By:   
Kenie Ho  
Reg. No. 51,808